Sullivan Ridge Planning (FINAL)

| FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: | Version # | APP # 700347 | |
|----------------------|-----------|--------------|--|
| FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: | Version # | APP # 700347 | |

A. Statement of Planning Objectives

The planning objectives for this project are to determine whether or not the Mendocino National Forest will add a Single-Track Trail in the Sullivan Ridge area to the National Forest Trail System and designate it as open to motorcycles only. Parts of this proposed Single-Track Trail in the Sullivan Ridge area was created by Club members under Forest Service authorization nearly a decade ago. This Single-Track Trail was used as an Enduro Only trail for several of the Enduro events held on the Grindstone Ranger District and the public has expressed interest in adding the Sullivan Ridge Single-Track Trail to the National Forest Trail System. In considering this proposal the Grindstone Ranger District will complete environmental studies to determine whether the single-track trail will be in accordance with NEPA and Best Management Practices guidelines, and if the Forest is able to add it to the designated trail system. The project area to be evaluated consists of 3.9 miles of single-track trail that runs along the Sullivan Ridge area.

B. Relation of Proposed Project to OHV Recreation

The Grindstone Ranger District has 8.5 miles of single-track trail designated as open to motorcycles only. When compared to a total of 128 miles of OHV trails on the Grindstone District, the total number of single-track trail is only 6% of the total OHV trail system. Considering that the vast majority of OHV users on the Grindstone Ranger District are recreating on motorcycles and that motorcycle only single-track trails are almost nonexistent on the district, the Sullivan Single-Track Trail may provide a needed addition to the National Forest Trail System. In addition, if this planning effort results in a decision to add this trail to the designated system, we will be creating a partnership with OHV club members who have expressed an interest in adopting the Sullivan Ridge single-track trail.

C. Statement of Activities

The funding request will provide for the development of an environmental analysis to determine whether the Grindstone Ranger District is able to add the Sullivan Ridge single-track to the designated trail system.

D. List of Reports

NEPA document (Decision Memo, EA or EIS) Sullivan Ridge Single-Track Trail

Version # Page: 1 of 10

Additional Documentation

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # _____ APP # 700347

1. Timeline for Completion

Attachments:

Timeline for Completion

2. Optional Project-Specific Application Documents

Attachments:

Single track trail sullivan ridge single track trail sullivan ridge 2

3. Optional Project-specific Maps

Attachments:

Map proposed sullivan ridge single track

Version # Page: 2 of 10

Project Cost Estimate

| | | FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: | Version # | | | APP # | | |
|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| APPLI | CANT NAME : | USFS - Mendocino National Forest | | | | | | |
| PROJI | ECT TITLE : | Sullivan Ridge Planning (FINAL) | | | | PROJECT NUMBE (Division use only | | |
| PROJI | ECT TYPE : | Acquisition | Development | | □ Educa | ation & Safety | Ground Ope | rations |
| | | Law Enforcement | Planning | | Resto | oration | | |
| The planning objectives for this projectives for this projectives for the National Forest Trail Systems of the Enduro events held on the National Forest Trail System. In a single-track trail will be in accordance system. The project area to be evaluated to the National Forest Trail System. | | | and designate it a prest Service autho e Grindstone Rang sidering this propo ith NEPA and Best | s open to motorcy rization nearly a d er District and the sal the Grindstone Management Pra | /cles only. Pa lecade ago. ∃ public has e e Ranger Dis actices guidel | arts of this proposed Sing This Single-Track Trail water expressed interest in add trict will complete enviro lines, and if the Forest is | gle-Track Trail in the S as used as an Endurc ling the Sullivan Ridge nmental studies to det able to add it to the d | Sullivan Ridge area Only trail for Single-Track Trail to ermine whether the |
| | Line Item | | Qty | Rate | UOM | Grant Request | Match | Total |
| DIREC | T EXPENSES | | | | | | | |
| Progra | am Expenses | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Staff | | | | | | | |
| | Other-Hydrologist | | 10.000 | 315.290 | DAY | 2,522.42 | 630.58 | 3,153.00 |
| | Other-Archaeologist | | 10.000 | 342.230 | DAY | 3,422.00 | 0.00 | 3,422.00 |
| | Other-Biologist | | 5.000 | 367.710 | DAY | 0.00 | 1,839.00 | 1,839.00 |
| | Other-Geologist | | 5.000 | 315.290 | DAY | 1,576.00 | 0.00 | 1,576.00 |
| | Other-Volunteers | | 5.000 | 200.000 | DAY | 0.00 | 1,000.00 | 1,000.00 |
| | Other-NEPA Coordin | ator | 7.000 | 393.570 | DAY | 2,755.00 | 0.00 | 2,755.00 |
| | Total for Staff | | | | | 10,275.42 | 3,469.58 | 13,745.00 |
| 2 | Contracts | | | | • | <u> </u> | | |

Page: 3 of 10 Version #

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010 Agency: USFS - Mendocino National Forest Application: Sullivan Ridge Planning (FINAL)

| | Line Item | Qty | Rate | UOM | Grant Request | Match | Total |
|------------------------|------------------------|---------|-------|-----------|---------------|-----------|-----------|
| 3 | Materials / Supplies | | | | | | |
| 4 | Equipment Use Expenses | | | | | | |
| | Field Vehicle | 400.000 | 0.370 | MI | 0.00 | 148.00 | 148.00 |
| 5 | Equipment Purchases | | | | | | |
| 6 | Others | | | | | | |
| 7 | Indirect Costs | | | | | | |
| Total Program Expenses | | | | 10,275.42 | 3,617.58 | 13,893.00 | |
| TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES | | | | | 10,275.42 | 3,617.58 | 13,893.00 |
| TOTAL EXPENDITURES | | | | 10,275.42 | 3,617.58 | 13,893.00 | |

Project Cost Summary for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010 Agency: USFS - Mendocino National Forest Application: Sullivan Ridge Planning (FINAL)

| | Line Item | Grant Request | Match | Total | Narrative |
|------------------------|------------------------|---------------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| DIRE | ECT EXPENSES | | | | |
| Prog | gram Expenses | | | | |
| 1 | Staff | 10,275.42 | 3,469.58 | 13,745.00 | |
| 2 | Contracts | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| 3 | Materials / Supplies | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| 4 | Equipment Use Expenses | 0.00 | 148.00 | 148.00 | |
| 5 | Equipment Purchases | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| 6 | Others | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| 7 | Indirect Costs | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| Total Program Expenses | | 10,275.42 | 3,617.58 | 13,893.00 | |
| тот | AL DIRECT EXPENSES | 10,275.42 | 3,617.58 | 13,893.00 | |
| тот | AL EXPENDITURES | 10,275.42 | 3,617.58 | 13,893.00 | |

Environmental Review Data Sheet (ERDS)

| | FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: | Version # | APP # 700347 | | | | |
|----|---|-------------------------|----------------------------------|------|-----------|-------|----------|
| | TEM 1 and ITEM 2 | | | | | | |
| | ITEM 1 | | | | | | |
| a. | ITEM 1 - Has a CEQA Notice of Determining (Please select Yes or No.) | ination (NOD) been f | iled for the Project? | С | Yes | • | No |
| | ITEM 2 | | | | | | |
| b. | Does the proposed Project include a red document preparation prior to implemen a two-phased Project pursuant to Section | ting the remaining Pr | roject Deliverables (i.e., is it | C | Yes | • | No |
| ı | TEM 3 - Project under CEQA Guideline | s Section 15378 | | | | | |
| C. | ITEM 3 - Are the proposed activities a "F (Please select Yes or No) | Project" under CEQA | Guidelines Section 15378? | C | Yes | • | No |
| d. | The Application is requesting funds sole and ensure public safety. These activitie environment and are thus not a "Project" | es would not cause ar | ny physical impacts on the | C | Yes | • | No |
| e. | Other. Explain why proposed activities was "Project" under CEQA. DO NOT comp | | physical impacts on the envir | onn | nent and | are | thus not |
| | This funding request is to conduct an an trail to the Mendocino National Forest de ground disturbing acitivities. | <u>-</u> | | | _ | _ | |
| ı | TEM 4 - Impact of this Project on Wetla | ands | | | | | |
| I | TEM 5 - Cumulative Impacts of this Pro | oject | | | | | |
| ı | TEM 6 - Soil Impacts | | | | | | |
| ı | TEM 7 - Damage to Scenic Resources | | | | | | |
| ı | TEM 8 - Hazardous Materials | | | | | | |
| | Is the proposed Project Area located on Section 65962.5 of the California Govern select Yes or No) | | | С | Yes | C | No |
| | If YES, describe the location of the haza taken to minimize or avoid the hazards. | ırd relative to the Pro | ject site, the level of hazard | and | the mea | sure | s to be |
| ı | TEM 9 - Potential for Adverse Impacts | to Historical or Cul | tural Resources | | | | |
| | Would the proposed Project have potent historical or cultural resources? (Please | - | ıl adverse impacts to | C | Yes | C | No |
| | Discuss the potential for the proposed P resources. | roject to have any su | bstantial adverse impacts to | hist | orical or | cultu | ural |

Version # Page: 6 of 10

ITEM 10 - Indirect Significant Impacts

CEQA/NEPA Attachment

Version # Page: 7 of 10

| DI ! | D | 0-111- |
|----------|---------|------------|
| Planning | Project | t Criteria |

| | FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: | Version # | APP # 700347 | | | | | |
|-------|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1. | Project Cost Estimate - Q 1. (Auto popu | ulates from Cost | Estimate) | | | | | |
| 1. | As calculated on the Project Cost Estimate, the percentage of the Project costs covered by the Applicant is 3 | | | | | | | |
| | (Note: This field will auto-populate once the Cost Estimate and Evaluation Criteria are Validated.) (Please selection one from list) | | | | | | | |
| | 76% or more (10 points) | | C 51% - 75% (5 points) | | | | | |
| | © 26% - 50% (3 points) | | C 25% (Match minimum) (No points) | | | | | |
| 2. | Planning Project - Q 2. | | | | | | | |
| A Pla | nning Project - Page 1 | | | | | | | |
| 2. | The Planning Project would address the | following 4 | | | | | | |
| B. Pl | ▼ Trail issues such as traffic patterns anning Project - Page 2 Explain each statement that was checked | n on special-status n on cultural resount n on soil condition n on water quality n on other recreati n on adjacent land stween OHV Recre n a Project Area on , trails closures, a | ion uses ds. eation and local residents r adjacent property that may impact OHV Recreation | | | | | |
| | OHV recreational opportunities related to | o single track trails and the single tracl | s are limited on the Grindstone Ranger District. This k opportunities, keeping use on designated trails and | | | | | |
| | (Check the one most appropriate) (Pleas | se select one fron | ı list) | | | | | |
| | 6 or more items checked (4 points) |) | C 4 to 5 items checked (3 points) | | | | | |
| | © 2 to 3 items checked (2 points) | | C 1 or no items checked (No points) | | | | | |
| 3. | Motorized Access - Q 3. | | | | | | | |
| 3. | | The Project would lead to improved facilities that provide motorized access to the following nonmotorized recreation opportunities 4 | | | | | | |
| | (Check all that apply) Scoring: 2 points e | ach, up to a maxi | mum of 6 points (Please select applicable values) | | | | | |
| | Camping | | Birding | | | | | |
| | ✓ Hiking | | Equestrian trails | | | | | |
| | Fishing | | Rock Climbing | | | | | |
| | Other (Specify) | | | | | | | |

Version # Page: 8 of 10

4. Public Input - Q 4.

5.

6.

7.

Explain each statement that was checked

| 4. | The Project proposal was developed with public input employing the following 2 | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|--|--|
| | (Check all that apply) Scoring: Maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values) ✓ Publicly noticed meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point) ✓ Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point) ✓ Meeting(s) with stakeholders (1 point) | | | | |
| | Explain each statement that was checked | | | | |
| | During the summer of 2006, the Forest held its first public meetings regarding the route designation process. In December of 2007 a conference call with District Ranger Eduardo Olmedo regarding the Valley Climbers Motorcycle Club's desire to adopt the Sullivan Ridge single track trail. On January 14, 2009, the District Ranger met in the field with interested parties to discuss the trail proposal. | | | | |
| | Stakeholder Input - Q 5. | | | | |
| 5. | If the Project were approved, the planning process would incorporate substantial stakeholder input: 5 | | | | |
| | (Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list) No (No points) Yes (5 points) | | | | |
| | If 'Yes', explain, specifically, how it would be 'substantial'. Identify stakeholders | | | | |
| | If it is determined to add the Sullivan Ridge trail to the designated trail system, the Valley Climbers Motorcycle Clu (substantial stakeholder) has committed to provide 100% of the labor to maintain 2.2 miles and build 1.7 miles of this single-track trail totaling 3.9 miles. | | | | |
| | Jtilization of Partnerships - Q 6. | | | | |
| 6. | The Project will utilize partnerships to successfully accomplish the Project. The number of partner organizations that will participate in the Project are 2 | | | | |
| | (Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list) | | | | |
| | 4 or more (4 points) © 2 to 3 (2 points) | | | | |
| | C 1 (1 point) None (No points) | | | | |
| | List partner organization(s) | | | | |
| | Valley Climbers Motorcycle Club Blue Ribbon Coalition | | | | |
| | Sustain OHV Opportunity - Q 7. | | | | |
| 7. | The Planning Project sustains OHV Opportunity in the following manner 10 | | | | |
| | (Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values) ☐ Project will develop management plans for existing OHV Opportunity (4 points) ☑ Project will complete environmental review for an OHV Development Project (3 points) ☑ Project supports development of OHV Opportunities adjacent to population centers (3 points) ☑ Project supports development of OHV Opportunities in areas that lack legal OHV Opportunity (2 points) ☑ Project will develop a system of designated OHV routes for an existing OHV Opportunity (2 points) | | | | |

Version # Page: 9 of 10

Planning Project Criteria for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010 3/1/2010 Applicant: USFS - Mendocino National Forest Application: Sullivan Ridge Planning (FINAL)

Portions of the Sullivan Ridge single track trail are already in existence. This project will complete the environmental review needed to determine whether or not to add it to the designated trail system. The Grindstone

| Ranger District is only 3 hours from the Sacramento and Bay Area metropolitan areas and it is seeing increase |
|--|
| OHV usage. There is a lack of single track OHV motorcycle opportunities in this area. This project will take an |
| existing route which is not currently part of the designated ohv system and consider incorporating it as part of a |
| sustainable trail system to accommodate increased OHV recreation use into the future. |
| |

9.

| | identification of Funding Sources - Q 8. | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|--|--|
| 8. | Funds for implementing the completed plan have been identified 5 | | | | |
| | (Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one for No (No points) | rom list) • Yes (5 points) | | | |
| | Explain 'Yes' response | | | | |
| | The Valley Climbers Motorcycle Club (VCMC) has committed to providing 100% of the labor and tools to maintain the 2.2 miles of existing trail, if it is determined to include this trail in the designated ohv trail system. The VCMC has also committed to providing 100% of the labor and tools to build, if approved by the MNF, 1.7 miles of new trail. | | | | |
| | Reference Document | | | | |
| | "Valley Climbers Motorcycle Club Proposal to Adopt a | partially Existing Non-NFTS Motorcycle Trail" | | | |
| | Offsite Impacts - Q 9. | | | | |
| 9. | The Planning Project would address offsite impacts relative to the Project Area (e.g., sound, fugitive dust, runoff): 5 | | | | |
| | (Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one f | rom list) | | | |
| | No (No points) | | | | |
| | Explain 'Yes' response | | | | |
| | The NEPA analysis will address any potential on and off site impacts related to this project proposal. | | | | |

Page: 10 of 10 Version #